



April 5, 2000

Mr. Robert A. Schulman
Schwartz & Eichelbaum, P.C.
Attorneys at Law
700 N. St. Mary's, Suite 1850
San Antonio, Texas 78205

OR2000-1319

Dear Mr. Schulman:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 134190.

The Medina Valley Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for records of the investigation into an incident involving a high school coach and a student, including any documents concerning any disciplinary action taken against the teacher. You claim that portions of the requested information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.026, 552.101, 552.102, 552.114, and 552.117 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

You assert that portions of the submitted information contain student information and, therefore, are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.026 and 552.114 of the Government Code. In Open Records Decision No. 634 (1995), this office concluded that (1) an educational agency or institution may withhold from public disclosure information that is protected by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 ("FERPA"), 20 U.S.C. § 1232g, and excepted from required public disclosure by sections 552.026 and 552.101 without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision as to those exceptions, and (2) an educational agency or institution that is state-funded may withhold from public disclosure information that is excepted from required public disclosure by section 552.114 as a "student record," insofar as the "student record" is protected by FERPA, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision as to that exception. "Education records" under FERPA are records that

- (i) contain information directly related to a student; and
- (ii) are maintained by an educational agency or institution or by a person acting for such agency or institution.

20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a)(4)(A). *See also* Open Records Decision Nos. 462 (1987), 447 (1986).

In this instance, you have submitted education records and redacted the student's name and other information which you assert personally identifies a particular student. FERPA requires the district to delete information from the requested information to the extent "reasonable and necessary to avoid personally identifying a particular student or one or both of the student's parents." Open Records Decision Nos. 332 (1982), 206 (1978). This identifying information is deemed confidential under FERPA and must be withheld from disclosure. We agree that the marked FERPA information must be withheld under sections 552.026 and 552.114 of the Government Code.

You have also highlighted information as being excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.102. Section 552.102 excepts from disclosure "information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy." Gov't Code § 552.102(a). In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers*, 652 S.W.2d 546 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref'd n.r.e.), the court ruled that the test to be applied to information claimed to be protected under section 552.102 is the same as the test formulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* for information claimed to be protected under the doctrine of common law privacy as incorporated by section 552.101 of the act. *Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). Therefore, we will address whether section 552.101 applies to the requested information.

Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Section 552.101 encompasses common law and constitutional privacy. Common law privacy excepts from disclosure private facts about an individual. *Id.* Information may be withheld from the public when (1) it is highly intimate and embarrassing such that its release would be highly objectionable to a person of ordinary sensibilities, and (2) there is no legitimate public interest in its disclosure. *Id.* at 685; Open Records Decision No. 611 at 1 (1992).

The constitutional right to privacy protects two interests. Open Records Decision No. 600 at 4 (1992) (citing *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985), *cert. denied*, 474 U.S. 1062 (1986)). The first is the interest in independence in making certain important decisions related to the "zones of privacy" recognized by the United States Supreme Court. Open Records Decision No. 600 at 4 (1992). The zones of privacy recognized by the United States Supreme Court are matters pertaining to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *See id.*

The second interest is the interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. The test for whether information may be publicly disclosed without violating constitutional privacy rights involves a balancing of the individual's privacy interests against the public's need to know information of public concern. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 at 5-7 (1987) (citing *Fadjo v. Coon*, 633 F.2d 1172, 1176 (5th Cir. 1981)). The scope of information considered private under the constitutional doctrine is far narrower than that under the

common law; the material must concern the "most intimate aspects of human affairs." *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 at 5 (1987) (citing *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village*, 765 F.2d 490, 492 (5th Cir. 1985), *cert. denied*, 474 U.S. 1062 (1986)).

This office has found that the following types of information are excepted from required public disclosure under constitutional or common law privacy: some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps), personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990), and information concerning the intimate relations between individuals and their family members, *see* Open Records Decision No. 470 (1987).

You assert that the highlighted conduct and statements made by the coach, the student, and the student's father are sufficiently personal and intimate to fall within the protection of section 552.101. You also assert that the highlighted medical information should be withheld under common law privacy. After reviewing the submitted information, we conclude that the highlighted information is not highly intimate and embarrassing such that its release would be highly objectionable to a person of ordinary sensibilities. Further, with regard to the coach's conduct and statements, there is a legitimate public interest in how a public employee conducts himself while on-duty and how he performs his job functions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 at 4 (1987) (public has legitimate interest in job performance of public employees), 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow). Further, we conclude that the medical information is not protected under section 552.101. Thus, we conclude that none of the highlighted information is protected by section 552.101 and common law privacy. The district must release the highlighted information.

We note, however, that section 552.117(1) excepts from disclosure information that relates to the home addresses, home telephone numbers, and social security numbers and family information of current and former employees of a governmental body who request that this information remain confidential in accordance with section 552.024 of the Government Code. You assert that the high school coach, on August 9, 1999, filed the appropriate objection to the release of his home address, telephone number, social security number, and family members. Based on this representation, we conclude that the coach timely elected to withhold this information pursuant to section 552.024. Thus, you must withhold the coach's home address under section 552.117(1) of the Government Code.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited


from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Jennifer Bialek
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JHB/ch

Ref: ID# 134190

Encl. Submitted documents

cc: Ms. Kathleen Bachus
Legacy Newspapers, Inc.
413 London Street
Castroville, Texas 78009
(w/o enclosures)